Mr. Javed Ahmad Ghamidi vs. Ali Sina Part 13

Javed Ahmad Ghamidi and Khalid Zaheer vs. Ali Sina Part VII

from		khalid zaheer
to	faithfreedom2 at gmail.com		
date	Dec 2, 2006 12:14 AM		

Dear Mr Ali Sina

One always learns new things while interacting with people. I had thought prior to receiving your last message that respect for the revered personalities of others was a virtue common to all humans. I am more enlightened now to know that it is not. It now seems that respecting others' revered personalities is an outcome of a feeling which like the ability to smell you either have in you or you don't have. Now that I know that you have been deprived of that sublime virtue, I won't complain any more to you for not demonstrating the presence of it in you. I promise you that and apologize for criticizing you for doing something you couldn't have done otherwise.

Estimated erudite scholars, Dr. Ghamidi and Dr. Zaheer:

Respecting beliefs is not a virtue at all. It is actually a fallacy. What is the definition of belief? **Belief means accepting a postulate without evidence**. Once you have evidence, then it is no longer a belief but a fact. A child may believe that if he eats watermelon seeds, watermelon plant will grow in his tummy. This belief does not have to be respected. Of course, you will smile and may even listen to his stories attentively. You don't ridicule him or put him down. He is after all a child. You love the child but it is ludicrous to say we must respect his silly belief too. As he grows and can understand things better, you explain to him that watermelons don't grow in the tummy.

Now what if this child becomes an adult and still wants to hold unto his foolish beliefs? (Much of the beliefs people hold sacrosanct is more ridiculous than the belief of watermelons growing in the tummy.) Do you still have to tolerate his foolish thoughts? Yes! As long as his beliefs do not harm others, you should tolerate them. It is not up to us to decide what people should believe and what they should not believe. This is the essence of freedom of thought. You and I may not agree with Hinduism, Christianity, Zoroastrianism or Bahai Faith. Since these beliefs are not intrusive, we have no right to stop them and force those who believe in them to abandon their beliefs. However, we must not tolerate beliefs that harm others. If a religion teaches, slay those who do not believe wherever you find them; they are unclean, do not associate with them and do not take them as friends, God hates them and they are fuel

for hellfire, such a religion is dangerous. All mankind must come together to eradicate this evil religion. A similar doctrine of hate brought much death and devastation in the last century. Everyone had to join force to fight it. We must not let this happen again. We must eradicate every evil doctrine. Intolerant beliefs should not be tolerated. When humanity fought and ended the evil doctrine of Nazism, everyone promised “never again”, but a similar or even more dangerous doctrine is rising its ugly head again. People are not opposing it because it is disguised as religion. We must unmask it and say no to it. Islam has brought more death and devastation than Nazism. It must be stopped before it burns the world. Another man in Iran is echoing the exact words of Hitler. He denies the holocaust while he is promising to deliver another. Hitler’s book has been the top bestseller in Turkey for several years now. Hitler is a hero to many Muslims. The Qur'an is more violent than Mein Kamph. We must not let Muslims do what Nazis did. Never again, we must let evil become strong.

Let me recapitulate:

- **Beliefs do not have to be respected.** All beliefs are subject to scrutiny and criticism and this is an essential part of freedom of expression. One must be free to deny and even to blaspheme God. No idea is beyond criticism.
- **We must be tolerant of all beliefs** even if we do not agree with them and retain the right to criticize them. The right to criticize all beliefs does not preclude respecting the right of others to believe in those very beliefs we criticize. As Voltaire said, “I may disagree with what you have to say, but I shall defend, to the death, your right to say it.”
- **Intolerant beliefs must not be tolerated.** Freedom must be preserved and this means we must fight and eradicate intolerant doctrines. They must be hunted down and uprooted. You are free but if you are a danger to others, you forfeit your freedom. This applies as much to people as it does to ideologies.

Free and civilized societies must protect the rights of ALL their citizens to be free. By “ALL” I mean everyone and not just the majority. Without freedom of thought and belief there is no freedom. So what if a group of people decides to impose its beliefs on others? In that case it is the responsibility of the state to subdue this group in order to protect others. Intolerance is not a right. You have the right to criticize any belief but you do not have the right to be intolerant, promote hate and call for violence. Those who do that must be stopped by law. If they do not understand logic they must be stopped by force. Your freedom ends where the freedom of others begins. This is the limit of freedom in free societies where everyone is free. Islam is uniquely evil. It is the only religion that promotes intolerance and hate. Therefore it is incumbent upon all freedom lovers of the world to fight it and eradicate it.

Muhammad did not respect anyone’s belief. It is not for this that we blame him. We blame him because he was intolerant of those beliefs.

> I can also see that there is an absence of appreciation of certain other matters in you as well. To you, trying to help a young man realize in a discreet manner that his parents weren't bound in a wedlock when he was born is quite the same as saying to him on face that he was a bastard, because your dictionary suggests that that's the right word for such children. Again, since it's not your fault that you aren't aware of the delicacies of a cultured communication between two decent people, I am not going to accuse you for not having demonstrated such appreciation in our discussion and would not blame you for violating the expectations of such communication. Again, it's a promise.

You are not the only one accusing me of being tactless. I am not prefect, and maybe my approach is not the best approach. Just the other day a friend wrote and said the same thing. I told him that I have been debating with Muslims, since 1998. At first, when I started, I adopted a very soft language. I even used the PBUH salutation every time I mentioned the name of Muhammad deferentially. I must have debated and exchanged emails with thousands of Muslims. Eventually I fine-tuned my methodology and language. I learned through experience that direct and blunt talk is more effective than trying to sugarcoat the words lest I offend someone's sensitivity. Now, I believe in the power of shock therapy. Based on my experience, it works best with Muslims. You know about shock therapy, don't you? **Shock therapy** is the deliberate induction of shock for the purpose of psychiatric treatment. It has been shown that states of shock can induce improvement in the patient's mental state.

Now, I am not saying that Muslims should be subjected to electroconvulsive therapy such as passing an electrical current through their brain (Although it may be worth a try). I want to apply the shock by exposing them, from early on, to the naked truth about Muhammad. This is how I came to my senses. My shock came to me after I read the Qur'an and I saw the sheer inhumanity of this book. Most of the testimonies of people leaving Islam also has elements of shock in them.

I find Muslims almost dead. They are so weighed down with nonsense and absurdity that it is difficult to make them reason or react to anything. You think calling Muhammad a pedophile is shocking. Believe me; to many Muslims, even this is not shocking. Read our forum and the debates we had with Muslims and you'll see that not only they are not shocked by this knowledge, but they even defend this despicable act of Muhammad. We have Muslims telling us that they would give their daughters in marriage at nine, just to make the point that there is nothing wrong in this shameful practice. We tell Muslims about Muhammad's massacres and they defend him. We speak of how he tortured Kinana to death and on that very night took his young wife, Safiyah, to bed and they do not blink. They justify his lootings, his assassinations and all his crimes. Nothing shocks Muslims anymore. They are dead. This is the death of conscience. A human who has no conscience is no better than an animal. This is a tragedy my valued friends.

Does shock therapy hurt? You bet it does. But it works. We have had people offended, cursing us and swearing at us, and yet these very people came back to say, you were right, Islam is indeed evil and Muhammad was a monster.

I have seen result in my “shock therapy” and that is why I do it. I don’t say my way is the best way. I say to those who tell me tone down, to start their own site and present the truth the way they think is more appropriate. FFI will be happy to host their sites for free. They can have their own domains and need not have any link to this site.

One site cannot be everything to everyone. It would be very noble to start a site that tells the Muslims “you are children of love” rather than bluntly telling them “you are bastards.” I am all with you. Do it! You have all my support. But that is not my methodology. Why don’t you start such a site?. You are the best to do it. You believe in Muhammad and love him and you can gently tell Muslims that some of their actions may not be right. Then again, isn’t this what you are doing already? Hasn’t this been done before, millions of times? What is the result? See where the Muslims are today! Just as the bitter fruit of oil palm will never become sweet as date by pruning the tree, Islam will ever become tolerant through reforms. This tree must be chopped down and fed to the furnace.

Some people want to dismantle the edifice of Islam slowly, brick by brick. I say good luck to them. It will take another thousand years to do it, if ever. I don't have that much time here and I don't think humanity can afford to wait any longer either. I want to uncork the Champaign and celebrate the end of Islam, with my friends at FFI. I leave others with their chisels and hammers at the roof top and go to the foundation. I know about Islam's major structural flaw and want to take advantage of that. Islam is built on moving sand, i.e. lies. All I have to do is to expose its foundation and let the sand wash away from beneath it. This mighty edifice will fall on its own. It will happen at once.

Five years ago I said the end of Islam will happen, give or take, in thirty years. I am now more certain than ever. I must say that I do not believe in prophecies. No one can predict the future. But I believe in projects and goal settings. Things do not happen on their own. We are the architects of our future. We can make things happen. We can build the future the way we want it. I want to be part of that construction crew and help build a world where no one detests another human being because his or her faith is not right. This is my dream. But I am not a dreamer. I rely on planning, strategies and smart work.

There is another problematic aspect of your messages which has been causing miscommunication between us: You say in your last message, for instance, that you have asked only three questions and not, as I accused you of, scores of them. In the meanwhile, you accuse the messenger of Islam of getting people killed, sleeping illegitimately with women etc. If these subjects weren't meant for discussion why were they brought forth in your message at all? Of course, such things help in creating stir amongst the readers who, as a result, are easily distracted from concentrating on the issues at hand. To understand what you are doing, take an example: Let's assume that you were attempting to prove that a certain young man was a bad person and you say that for the moment you were bringing only three reasons to prove your point: the young man steals, uses foul language, and teases ladies in the streets. However, while talking about him you also say, by the way, that the young man was also guilty of murder, rape, and torturing other people, but you clarify that you were accusing him of committing the first three crimes only for the moment and request for the other three to not be counted as allegations. For what purpose then, one may ask you, the latter three crimes have been mentioned? Of course, the only reason their mention has been made is the contribution they promise to make in stirring the emotions of those people whose concentration you don't want to be fully absorbed in the three points you have initially raised for discussion. If the first three points are being debated, let them first be discussed exhaustively before any new are brought forth. Likewise, there was no reason to mention references of all your writings on subjects that have hitherto not been brought on the table for discussion. What I have been emphasizing all along is that either you bring a matter for discussion and do full justice with it or you don't mention it at all. These tricks of cleverly influencing the minds of readers by referring to matters that aren't being discussed are normally indicative of the writer's lack of confidence in the strength of his arguments in the topics he has already raised for discussing. If you want to say that the prophet of Islam was guilty of killing people, then say that you want to discuss it as a topic. While talking about intercession and bringing forth references of your articles which are accusing the messenger of even more serious crimes is indicative of a complete absence of the sense of serious discussion. It is simply emotional rhetoric and, I repeat, it serves to simply influence the easily distracted (whom I called the feeble-minded) readers.

You have a valid point. I am not in disagreement with you. However, please acknowledge that the life of Muhammad was full of crimes. One can't talk about him without talking of his crimes. I assure you that I did not bring up these things as new subjects or as you say to "influence and distract the feeble minded." This is a heavy subject and those who read it are generally people with strong views and opinions of their own. As I said before, feebleminded people often get offended by this site and don't read through it. Many of them also can't access this site because it is blocked in their countries.

You made an example. Let me use that for clarification. Suppose while you accuse this man of the charges that you bring against him, the judge asks you, "When did you see him using foul language and teasing that woman?" and you respond, "Just before he took his knife and stabbed her." Although your accusation that the defendant is guilty of murder is not yet proven, you are not at fault in saying that.

Notwithstanding, and to show my good will, I will be extra vigilant to not say anything that you may find the need to rebut beyond the topic that we are discussing. I hope this will expedite our discussion and we can go swiftly over each topic and move on. I have tremendous respect for you because I find you sincere and truthful individuals. This is not what I would say about most Muslim apologists. The very fact that you accepted this invitation to debate is proof enough of your sincerity and conviction. You believe that Islam is true and are not afraid to share what you know with the world. Many other scholars have been invited to debate but they brought excuses, made some ad hominem remarks about me and backed down. They accused me of “misleading innocent Muslims”. If that is true, isn’t it their duty to guide Muslims by showing them my errors? I am giving them ample opportunity to do that. They can write anything they want and I will publish or they can use the forum. So aren’t they failing their duty to help Muslims see the truth? What I do and say is not out of malice. Even my enemies acknowledge that I am sincere in my views. There is no personal gain for me in doing what I do. In fact I had to readjust my lifestyle and renounce many luxuries that previously I took for granted in order to be able to carry on with my campaign of eradicating Islam. If what I do is out of ignorance, then no harm will come to me. Unlike the terrorists I am not hurting anyone physically and if I hurt their feelings, that is their business. Let them grow tougher skin. But what about these “scholars” who accuse me of misleading Muslims and then withhold the truth from people and snob when they are asked to come and show my errors? Who do you think God will punish? If I am wrong, then I am only an ignorant. However, they are guilty of far bigger sins – the sin of haughtiness, of withholding the truth and of pride.

You do not belong to that crowd. You are good people. Now, one of us is wrong (i.e. if both of us are not wrong, which is often the case when two people disagree). That is no sin. We are both open to learn new things. I learned from you to focus on one charge at a time. Being a positive thinker, I pretend you were not being sarcastic and have learned that beliefs do not have to be respected. People have to be respected but beliefs are there to be scrutinized and criticized. So things look upwards.

You have restarted the debate on the usage of shifting pronouns and the alleged inconsistency in the mention of intercession in the Qur’an. You are most welcome to do so. I mentioned to you the example of two poets who, like the Qur’an, used third person singular pronouns for themselves despite being the authors of those duplets simply to show that if the Qur’an was doing likewise, it was not a mistake; instead, it was completely in line with the tradition of high-class literary presentations. Interestingly, you mention that the Bible is a more clearly written work whose language doesn’t create the kind of problems the Qur’an creates. How would you react to the frequent use of the of expression ‘son of man’ Jesus Christ uses for himself? Of course, in your literary taste that too should count as a mistake. To us, whether it is the use of ‘son of man’ for Jesus in the Bible or He, We, or I for God in the Qur’an, none are mistakes in the use of nouns or pronouns. Instead, if properly understood, they lift the presentations of these works to a high level of excellence, for the appreciation of which one should have that, what seems now, rare gift of literary taste which, I claim, has as yet eluded you too, although, I am sure, it hasn’t eluded all the readers of your site.

Okay, I think we both said enough on this topic. Let us move on.

The case of intercession is also not getting the right appreciation from you. I would like you to realize one thing more: When you say that a certain matter is illogical, absurd, or intellectually unacceptable, it is not enough for you to just say that you don't like the matter or that had you been in charge of the affairs, you would have done such and such thing differently. It is imperative that you show most clearly that the matter you are criticizing is indeed absurd from all points of view. For instance, it is rational to claim that a certain country was run undemocratically if the head of the state was taking all key decisions on his own. However, it would be unfair to declare it undemocratic if the country was properly following a presidential form of government, like in America , simply on account of the fact that the critic himself was from Britain and was more convinced that the parliamentary system of government was more democratic. Likewise, it is important that the process of accountability in the hereafter should appear to be absolutely fair. However, intercession in the form of request to the Almighty that in no way is going to influence the fair nature of accountability in the hereafter cannot be picked for criticism on account of it making the process appear unfair. You ask what the intercessor is going to add to the knowledge of God by interceding on behalf of someone else. My answer is, indeed nothing. But who said that intercession was going to add anything to God's knowledge. God Himself makes the clarification in the Qur'an that intercession shall not add anything to His knowledge: "Who is there who can intercede before Him except by His leave. He knows what is there before them and behind them." (Qur'an; 2:255) The intercession allowed is going to take care of the sensibilities of good people for others. God wants us to have feelings of sympathy for others. He allows those feelings to be expressed before Him in this world in the form of prayers for others, which again are expressions of sympathy and love for others and not an attempt to add to God's knowledge or to appear more merciful than Him. He tells us that He is going to allow the same thing to happen in the case of some pious people on the Day of Judgment too. Where has this concept gone wrong? Where does it suggest that something is going to be added to God's knowledge by the one who is going to intercede? Clearly, it appears that if you were God, you wouldn't have allowed such subtleties of human nature as pleading on behalf others to be given the chance of expression on a day when it is going to matter the most for everyone. Thanks God we have a highly considerate, sympathetic God!

So your understanding is that Allah wants us humans to have empathy for each other but in practice He will do as he pleases anyway and will disregard our feelings for one another. That sounds quit silly on Allah's part and frankly quite cruel. If he asks us to pray for one another, he must answer those prayers. Otherwise he is taking us for a ride. How do you feel knowing Allah is not going to answer your prayers for your beloved dad and yet he tells you pray for him? Wouldn't that make you feel foolish, let down?

You have also alleged that we are emotionally attached to the man we believe to be the prophet of God and therefore despite attempting to be rational individuals we are caught up in a situation of cognitive dissonance. As a result, you believe, we cannot be expected to be fair in a discussion that has been undertaken to ascertain whether the person was a messenger of God or not. For one thing, if your observation is correct, please admit the other side of the problem too. You too are emotional about him. In your case, though, the emotions are negative. If we are incapable of rationally thinking about him because we are overly attached to him positively, you too should be considered unqualified to say anything about him objectively because of your overly negative attitude.

Absolutely! I have never tried to hide the fact that I am biased against Muhammad and Islam. However, I am not prejudiced. There is a difference. If I did not know much about Islam and say, I was born into another religion where I was indoctrinated from childhood to dislike Islam, then you could say I am prejudiced. Judging something before having the full knowledge of it is prejudice. However, once you come to know something up close and then reject it, you can no longer be accused as being prejudiced, because your aversion of that thing is based on knowledge and not on ignorance. Not all snakes are poisonous. If you know a snake is poisonous and avoid handling it, you are just being wise. That is not called prejudice.

My aversion to Islam is based on the knowledge of the fact that it is deadly and dangerous. Thanks to this knowledge, I believe, I am totally qualified to pass judgments on Islam. We, the ex-Muslims, are the most qualified people to speak about Islam. We do not speak out of ignorance, prejudice or blind faith. There was a time that we were ready to die for our faith. Now that we have learned the truth we want to save mankind from it. We have seen the real face of it and more than anyone else know the threat that it poses to the peace of the world and particularly to the Muslims themselves. Our own relatives are in danger. The city of my birth, where my relatives and my childhood friends live, can go up in smoke because of Islam and the insanity that it has instilled in some of my people. Why there has been always war between Pakistan and India? What was the need for Pakistan to begin with? The very existence of Pakistan as a separate country, hostile to its own kinsfolk on the other side of the border, is a testimony of the insanity of Islam. The very concept of Pakistan is stupidity upon stupidity. You could have been part of the great nation of India. Now you spend most of your wealth building atomic bombs to kill your own kin just because now you distinguish yourselves as Muslims. Haven't enough people died because of this lie?

It would be unethical if we stayed silent after what we have learned. Let us say people start getting sick and dying in your township. No one knows the cause. Each blames something. Somehow, you come to learn that the water reservoir is poisoned. If you remain silent, you are guilty as hell. You must speak out and warn everyone not to drink the water. That is what we are doing at FFI. We are warning everyone, Muslims and non-Muslims, that Islam is poison. This doctrine is killing us. We must get rid of it if we want to save the world.

What is the right approach if someone says the cause of the epidemic death is the city water? Would you force him to shut up? Would you silence him because what he says may cause public panic or make you, the owner of the reservoir lose profit? That would be criminal. What if he is right? The right approach is to test the water. That is what we are asking everyone to do. We are asking the world to examine Islam. Don't be afraid to ask tough questions lest you hurt Muslims' sensitivity. To hell with their sensitivity! Ask the questions because this is a matter of life and death. Those who own this water system, advertise it and tell us it is safe, are dying themselves. They must prove that what they sell is safe. We see the result and see that they are sick and dying. Their disease is affecting everyone and others are dying too. Are they going to be offended if we tell them your water is poisoned? Why should we give a damn? Let them be offended. There is much more at stake than the feelings of these people. They are not only offended, their source of income is also in danger, so they kill anyone who says this water is poisonous. That is why we are forced to hide our faces and use the Internet to warn the world. And what do you do? You gag us and block our site so our voice does not reach the Muslims. This makes you accomplice of the terrorists.

I have received countless emails from Muslims who told me they were once filled with hatred of everyone and now that they left Islam they have learned how to love all mankind. This is my reward. I don't need a newer car, vacations and dining out. I get all the highs I need when I receive such confessions and know that I made a difference, that my life has a purpose and that I have been an instrument of peace. Would you believe that this has been my childhood prayer? Now, my prayer is being answered. What else I need? Every time someone writes to thank for helping him see the truth, for abandoning the doctrine of hate and for learning to love all people, I get the same sensation that one gets when he wins a lottery. That may happen to a few once in a lifetime, but I get that feeling time and again and as the site reaches more people, it is bound to be more.

What about you? How would you, Dr. Ghamidi, feel when one day you realize you blocked this site in Pakistan and as such prevented many youths from seeing the truth who in turn went on to become terrorists, killed themselves and other innocent people? How will you face your creator and answer to him for what you have done? You did it out of ignorance and "good faith". The road to hell is paved with good faith. Meanwhile lives were lost, people were maimed for life and so many people agonized for the loss of their loved ones. I don't believe in intercession so don't come to me for help. You would be on your own on that day my friends.

Having said that, let me tell you that we both, myself and Mr Javed Ahmad Ghamidi, have not followed the normal pattern in becoming believing Muslims. The religious view of Mr Ghamidi's father was very different from what his view is. He has earned every bit of his faith and attachment to Islam rationally. His emotional attachment to the messenger of Islam is only the natural outcome of his understanding that Muhammad was the messenger of God. Having reached that understanding intellectually, it was but natural that he became emotionally attached to him. That is exactly what he has taught us all along: to not allow our emotions to have the better of our intellect. It is only through the censure of intellect that emotions should be allowed to play a role in our life. It is because of this approach that he has disagreed with the traditional scholars in the manner he understands the teachings of Islam in a number of areas. It is because of the same approach that he confidently accepted the offer to have an open discussion with you on Islam. He believes that the message of Islam is the ultimate message from God Almighty for the entire humanity. He is confident that the message is so rational that every truth-seeking individual would be affected by its veracity provided it is presented properly and the addressee receives it with an unbiased attention.

I have no doubt that you and our revered friend Dr. Ghamidi are not the average kind of Muslims I am dealing with on daily basis. I can see clearly you are different. I already mentioned that by accepting this invitation you proved your sincerity. You are not only learned but also wise and rational. You are above all polite, which is the hallmark of all great men. You are also fair-minded. This is a quality scarcer than diamond. It is because of these noble traits that I am confident you will eventually come to see the truth. The reason you do not agree with me is because you have not been exposed to the truth yet. All your life you were fed with lies. The truth was hidden from us. I did not know the truth either. I found it on my own and it was not easy. Now that I have found it I want to share it with everyone. I am glad that I was born in this day and age that technology allows me to do what others that preceded me could not do. If we continue this debate you will come to see what I saw too. What would you do with it then is up to you. I do not expect you to do what I do. And as you said, my approach may not be the best approach anyway. You will find your way to bring the Muslims out of darkness and with your knowledge of Islam you can become a shining star and change the course of history. I see that potential in you. (Anytime I say "you" I mean both you and Dr. Ghamidi) I am really nobody. This cause is ready to receive its giants – men and women who would make history and will pass to history. There is no nobler cause than awakening the Muslims and saving mankind from another disaster.

My entry into Islam in the real sense was also the result of a serious Intellectual exercise. I considered myself a non-believer when I was a teenager despite being a born Muslim. My decision of not accepting Islam from inside then was, I admit, an emotional, irrational decision. When I started taking its message rationally, things started falling into their proper places. A brief description of how it all happened is mentioned in my website www.khalidzaheer.com under the title “A Quarter of a Century Ago”. In brief, I can say that as a teenager I wanted to reject Islam for emotional, non-intellectual reasons and for that purpose I looked for arguments to do so. However, when I allowed myself the privilege of intellectual objectivity, I was able to see the light of the day.

You say that your reversion to Islam was the result of a serious intellectual exercise. I read your testimony and saw nothing of that nature. Your beloved father passed away and suddenly you felt distraught and sought your refuge in your ancestral religion, just like anyone from any religion would do. What part of this is intellectual exercise? You were young , impressionable and easy to fleece. Have you read the stories of the suicide bombers? Many of them have been irreligious all their lives. Suddenly, a life crisis hits them and they seek Islam, are filled with zealotry, and then go to blow up themselves and other innocent people. Thanks heaven when this happened to you Islamic terrorism was not yet a vogue, otherwise you were a perfect candidate to become a terrorist. Today’s Muslim youths who have similar experiences, become suicide bombers.

You were influenced by Bertrand Russell. You rejected God and afterlife. Suddenly you could not bear the pain of losing your dear father to nothingness. You needed the comfort of believing that he is still alive. So you went to Islam because Islam claims dead people will go to heaven. This is called emotive decision not rational decision. Let us call the spade a spade.

Now, I am not saying that God and afterlife are fairytales. Most of mankind believes in them and I see no harm in such belief. Personally I never called myself an atheist. I do not believe in the God of most religions. I believe in the Single Principle underlying the creation and that is my God. That is beyond the point. Let us say God exists and He is the creator of the universe. What Allah and Muhammad have to do with God? This is like you decide to believe in God and go to David Koresh. There is no proof that Muhammad was a prophet of God. All evidences point to the fact that he was an insane man. I have written a book to prove just that. Here we are talking about Muhammad, not God. Many people who believe in God do wonderful things. They go to other countries, to those who are in need and help them in anyway they can. They built hospitals, feed the hungry, built schools and try to improve people’s lives. What do the believers of Allah do? They build mosques and madrassahs to raise more terrorists, to spew hate, to wage jihad. The money raised by the charity of other people goes to help humans who are in need. Muslims pay their charities to expand Islam and promote more hate. I am not against God. I am against Muhammad and his fictitious Allah.

When you read the Qur'an you were vulnerable and as such not objective. In that state of mind you could not have been rational. I read the Qur'an when I was not in any emotional turmoil. I simply wanted to increase my knowledge and deepen my understating. Unlike you, I was not desperate to believe. I was shocked by the asininity and violence of this book.

In your testimony you wrote, “If you approach the Qur'an with strings of conditions attached to your probing, you are bound to fail in your quest.”

The only condition I had was rationality. The only expectation that I had was that the book of God must make sense. It didn’t. That was enough evidence that this book is not from God. It is insane to read a book and accept anything it says unconditionally. You presumed a priory that the Qur'an is the word of God and then accepted anything it says unconditionally. If this is not lunacy what is? Do you see now how the foundation of your faith is based on a fallacy? How are you going to answer to your creator when He asks you why did you believe in the messenger of Satan, didn't you see he was a pervert and his book was full of errors? Would you then say, "Oh dear God, I just surrendered my intelligence and allowed to be fooled unconditionally with empty promises and be scared with dreadful tales of hell?" If God gave us brain, it is because he wanted us to use it. Did you use yours when you read and accepted the Qur'an unconditionally? If you did and if all what you read was rational and logical as you say, you must be able to explain that to us logically. Do not expect us to throw away our reasons and just believe because you tell us how good you feel. You can feel good by using a narcotic and religion is equated to the opium of the less brainy people. Give us one single proof that the Qur'an is the book of God and I will throw away this site, which is the fruit of years of my tireless work, in a heartbeat.

People follow all sorts of charlatans believing them to be divine beings. In my book *Inside Muhammad’s Mind: A Psychobiography of Allah’s Prophet,* I have talked about cults and how they control the minds of people. Please read the story of John de Ruiter. This conman passes himself as the son of God and there is no dearth of fools who believes in him. They go to his seminars and he sits there in absolute silence. Half an hour passes and he says nothing, just starring ahead like a mummy. You can hear a pin drop. Then some of his brain dead devotees start sobbing. This creates a creepy and suggestive atmosphere, which impresses some feebleminded ones who come out thinking this fool is the personification of God. There is a psychiatrist among his followers who says in his thirty years of practice he has never seen a "saner" person than John de Ruiter. For your information this loony is also a sexual pervert. This is the trait of all insane cult leaders. Should we believe in him? What is his proof? Nothing! It is all sensationalism and playing with emotions. That is how you fell for Islam. Your faith in Islam is just as valid as is the faith of the unfortunate followers of John de Ruiter and other narcissist self proclaimed prophets like Jim Johns, David Koresh, Shoko Asahara, Sun Miun Moon, etc. As long as you can’t prove Islam logically, do not call your faith logical. You are a victim of emotionalism. There is nothing rational in your approach and conversion. Emotions mislead people. Millions of people have been misled by emotions and then went on to commit the most insane acts of inhumanity. It is foolish to follow one’s emotions.

I am not saying you should abandon your love for God. You can still love God without following any religion. Your late father may at this very moment be lying on his belly close to my grandfather drinking wine while both of them are being massaged by two gorgeous naked houris. (I know my grandmother would not like this but hey, she is just a woman, why she should matter?). They are semi drunk and laugh their heads off at you and me and what we say to each other. That is all good and dandy. I have no problem with that belief and I wish it were true. My point is that if you want to follow a religion, there are good religions to follow. Follow Christ. He was a good man and his teachings are good. Follow Buddha, to become enlightened like him. Follow Krishna or Zoroaster. If you have to follow someone, at least follow someone good. I am not a follower, but if you have to be one, why follow the most evil man that ever walked on earth? If there is an afterlife, Muhammad is sure in the pit of hell for what he did. Don't race to join him there.

In your testimony you wrote: “However, if you surrender yourself to that greatest treasure of knowledge unconditionally, its marvellous wisdom will never disappoint you.”

First of all you don’t “surrender” to knowledge. You grasp it. It is an “AHA”. It is a victory. This Freudian slip of tongue shows what you have found is ignorance. Otherwise you would not have used the term “surrender”. 2+3=5. This is truth and knowledge. You don’t have to surrender to it. It is something you grasp. It is a fact that is self evident and can be proven. But if I tell you 2+X=5 and if you believe it without knowing what X stands for, then you are surrendering your intelligence to me. What if X is a number that makes the equation false? You are relying on me being truthful, but have you checked my credentials to see whether I fit the profile of a truthful person? Now what if I demand you to believe and threaten to kill you and promise that God will burn you for eternity if you don’t believe? Would you believe then? I hope not! Then you know I am a psychopath for sure. So why do you believe everything Muhammad said unconditionally and without checking his credentials? This man lived a very unholy life. He benefited immensely by making people do anything he wanted including raiding innocent people, bringing him the booty, which included young women and enriching himself. How can he be trusted when he says the most absurd stories about receiving messages from an angel and you can see for yourself that none of his claims add up?

So with all due respect to you my dear professor, you have fallen into the trap of a charlatan and have embraced ignorance. Am I wrong? Prove me wrong. Give me one, just one evidence that the Qur'an is the word of God and I too will become a believer. You say you made a rational choice. Well, show it to us! Talk is cheap. I want some proof. You talk the talk, but are you able to walk the walk?

We are not the only two, unique Muslims who have a different story of intellectual journey towards Islam to relate. I know directly many converts to Islam who, not through any propaganda campaigning, entered the fold of Islam willingly on being struck by the intellectual superiority of the Qur'an. No indecent rhetoric can ever stop that flow from continuing. Despite many foolish things Muslims of today keep doing every now and then, the flow of humans into Islam seems unstoppable right under the very nose of the Western society. Had Islam not had its own intrinsic intellectual, moral, and spiritual power, it would already have gone into extinction because of the irrational attitude of many born Muslims. All that I am trying to say is this: Please don't make unsubstantiated claims about the
faith of all Muslims. There is a difference between those who are Muslims by birth and those who are Muslims by rational choice.

I read your story and it is clear that your choice in coming to Islam has not been rational but very emotive. I haven't read the story of Dr. Ghamidi yet and frankly I have never read any story of someone converting to Islam rationally. All the stories I read so far, and I read hundreds of them, show that people who converted to Islam, were moved by their emotions and most of the time during a hard time in their lives when they were suggestible and easy to fall pray to any bogus promise for its feel good factor. At the time that you wanted to believe your father is not lost for ever, you had only Islam to give you that promise. What if you were born to a Christian or Jewish family? Then you would have sought these religions as solace and would have become a devote Jew or a Christian. Isn't it clear that your going back to Islam has been anything but rational?

Now, as for your claim that everyone is converging to Islam, I am sorry to burst your bubble. Today the biggest movement is that of the ex-Muslims. Smart people are leaving Islam everywhere. It is not because what Muslims do, but because the truth is getting out and good people caught in this web of lies are finding out that they have been fooled.

If Islam had any intellectual or moral base as you claim, you would not have blocked faithfreedom.org in Pakistan. Truth does not fear lies. It is the other way round. It is darkness that is afraid of light. We do not ban Muslims from writing in our forum. They are most welcome and they do come to advertise their religion. Unfortunately, they often end up insulting us before going. Any rational person can see we are not afraid of confronting Islam, logically. It's the Muslims who are afraid of us. As Muhammad used to say "we have cast terror in their hearts." The moment Pakistan blocked this site, they sent a clear signal that Islam is false and that in an arena where reason alone is the rule of the game, Islam is the loser.

You have asked a question about the beginning of the second chapter of the Qur'an. You are most welcome. The verse says Alif Laam Meem. Dhalika al-Kitabu Laa Raaiba Feehe. The meaning of this passage is this: Alif Laam Meem are three alphabets of Arabic language. There are many surahs (chapters of the Qur'an) that begin in similar styles. It was a known style in the literary presentations of the Arabs that a presentation would begin with
some alphabets that would identify it from other presentations. The passage simply means: "This is Alif Laam Meem. This chapter (is a part of) the awaited book (al-kitab); there is no doubt about it." In other words, the first statement is introducing the name of the surah (chapter) and then it goes on to mention that this surah is a part of the book, i.e. the Qur'an, which is the promised book that the open-mined, religious people amongst the Jews and Christians were awaiting. The negation of doubt is regarding the fact that the Qur'an is the book religious Jews and Christians were
awaiting. Please let me know where you are finding it difficult to
understand this passage. I will elaborate it more for you.

So you say that these disjoint letters at the beginning of some suras are a system for identifying the suras? Will you please explain how it works? They seem to be by themselves a source of confusion. A clear classification is something like sura 1, sura 2, sura 3, and so on and it should be either chronological or arranged by content, which the Qur'an is neither. You could even replace the numbers with letters if you like. In those days people used *abjad*. However the classification in the Quran is not clear at all. If I find a page from chapter 6 of a book at the top says chapter 6 or it has the title of the chapter. If I find a sura of the Quran that starts with Y S, TM, or ALM, how do I know which chapter it is? Both sura 2 and 32 start with ALM, how is it that two distinct suras have the same distinguisher and why most of the suras do not have any distinguisher? The Quranic suras are named and numbered. So what is this identifier you are talking about for? Yes please do elaborate! What you explained so far did not explain anything. Furthermore you did not say why the Quran says there is no doubt in it when most people doubt it and why Allah is so confused about the pronouns that calls "this" book, "that" book. You also did not explain those violent and hate laden verses I asked you to explain.

Finally, I would like to comment on your mention that we should continue to debate if not for the sake of helping you in removing doubts about the teachings of Islam then at least for the sake of the large number of readers who visit your site regularly. I would like to remind you that we started this discussion to respond to your questions on Islam. We have already undertaken a number of projects to promote the true message of Islam (which is, by the way, what causes my responses not to be prompt). We would like to focus our attention on them for the moment. However, it is our commitment that whoever shows keenness in knowing about Islam or has reservation about our religion he/she wants to be responded to, we are available, as far as is possible for us, to all such people. It is in this spirit that we are responding to your messages as well. If in the process some other people are also reading our messages, it is a bonus advantage for us. However, those others are not the reason why we are responding to your messages. Now that we are clear that you have an excuse for using the language that to us is objectionable, we are not making any threats to withdraw from this discussion on that count. May God guide us all to the right path!

Khalid Zaheer

I am glad to hear that you are willing to continue. It is an honor for me. It is really important that we continue this discussion. Your readiness to continue only is proof of your sincerity and your conviction. This is not about winning and losing. You are men of erudition and your main concern is to get at the truth. The silly thought of "who is winning" is for, as you say, the feebleminded ones. Great men like your good selves are after the truth and above these puerile considerations. When the truth is exposed everyone is victorious.

I have not used offensive language. It is beyond my control that you take offence of what I say about Muhammad. You love this man and I am accusing him of horrendous crimes. It is natural that you would be offended. But if I am not allowed to say these things lest I offend you, then what is the point of this debate?

Anyway, I think we have clarified a lot of misunderstandings and particularity those three topics are explained exhaustively by both sides. I would like now to move to the next topic.

Question # 4

This response became too long, so I will ask a very short question.

Will people be raised from dead on the Last Day to receive their punishment and rewards as verses , 2.260, 21.21, 6.36, 7.57, 30.50, 35.9, 43.11, 72.7, indicate or do they receive it right after their death as it is stated in verse 3.169?

There seems to be a contradiction. Please explain.

2.260, And when Ibrahim said: My Lord! show me how Thou givest life to the dead, He said: [Note how Allah is referring to himself in 3rd person. It is all over the Qur'an.] What! and

do you not believe? He said: Yes, but that my heart may be at ease. He said: Then take four of the birds, then train them to follow you, then place on every mountain a part of them, then call them, they will come to you flying; and know that Allah is Mighty, Wise.

21.21, Or have they taken gods from the earth who raise (the dead).

6.36, Only those who listen; and (as to) the dead, Allah will raise them, then to Him they shall be returned.

7.57, And He it is Who sends forth the winds bearing good news before His mercy, until, when they bring up a laden cloud, We drive it to a dead land, then We send down water on it, then bring forth with it of fruits of all kinds; thus shall We bring forth the dead that you may be mindful.

30.50, Look then at the signs of Allah's mercy, how He gives life to the earth after its death, most surely He will raise the dead to life; and He has power over all things.

35.9, And Allah is He Who sends the winds so they raise a cloud, then We drive it on to a dead country, and therewith We give life to the earth after its death; even so is the quickening.

43.11, And He Who sends down water from the cloud according to a measure, then We raise to life thereby a dead country, even thus shall you be brought forth;

72.7 And that they thought as you think, that Allah would not raise anyone:

3.169 And reckon not those who are killed in Allah's way as dead; nay, they are alive (and) are provided sustenance from their Lord;